

Vibrations and Berry Phases of Charged Buckminsterfullerene

Assa Auerbach

Physics Department, Technion-IIT, Haifa 32000, Israel.*

February 1, 2008

Abstract

A simple model of electron-vibron interactions in buckminsterfullerene ions is solved semiclassically. Electronic degeneracies of C_{60}^{n-} induce dynamical Jahn-Teller distortions, which are unimodal for $n \neq 3$ and bimodal for $n = 3$. The quantization of motion along the Jahn-Teller manifold leads to a symmetric-top rotator Hamiltonian. I find Molecular Aharonov-Bohm effects where electronic Berry phases determine the vibrational spectra, zero point fluctuations, and electrons' pair binding energies. The latter are relevant to superconductivity in alkali-fullerenes.

PACS: 33.10.Lb, 71.38.+i, 74.20.-z

For polyatomic molecules, the adiabatic approximation is often used to eliminate fast electrons in favor of an effective potential for the slow nuclei. This approximation requires special care when the positions of the nuclear coordinates are near points of electronic degeneracy. If the electron-ion interaction is linear in the ionic displacements (a generic case for symmetric, non colinear molecules [1]) the classical Jahn Teller theory [2] predicts that the molecule distorts and some (or all) of the electronic degeneracy is lifted. The

*Email: assa@phassa.technion.ac.il

classical JT theory is controlled by the largeness of $S = |E^{JT}|/(\hbar\omega)$, where ω is the characteristic vibrational frequency, and E^{JT} is the relaxed energy of the distortion. For $S = \infty$, (i.e. “strong coupling” or “classical” limit), the zero point motion of the ions is ignored.

At finite S however, quantum corrections can be quantitatively and qualitatively important. For example, while the JT distortion may break the Hamiltonian symmetry, quantum fluctuations along the degenerate manifold or tunneling between JT minima can restore the ground state symmetry[3]. This is often called the “Dynamical Jahn Teller” effect. In addition, ion coordinates may be subject to quantum interference effects. Longuet-Higgins has found that a vibrational orbit which surrounds a point of two-fold electronic degeneracy, can acquire a negative sign from the transport of the electron’s wave function [3]. This effect, often dubbed as the “Molecular Aharonov Bohm (MAB) effect”, produces in triangular molecules half-odd integer quantum numbers. This has been recently confirmed spectroscopically in Na_3 [4]. The MAB effect is a simple example of the geometrical Berry phase, which appears in a wide host of quantum phenomena [5].

The soccer-ball shaped molecule C_{60} (buckminsterfullerene) and its various crystalline compounds have ignited enormous interest in the chemistry and physics community in past two years [6]. Since the discovery of superconductivity in A_3C_{60} ($\text{A}=\text{K}, \text{Cs}, \text{Rb}$), with relatively high transition temperatures ($T_c \approx 20^\circ\text{--}30^\circ\text{K}$), much attention has been given to the electronic properties of charged C_{60}^{n-} ions. C_{60} a highly symmetrical molecule (a truncated icosahedron), and its electronic lowest unoccupied molecular orbitals (LUMO) are three-fold degenerate. Thus the C_{60}^{n-} ions are natural candidates for manifestations of dynamical JT effects and MAB effects discussed above. Several groups have identified the five-fold degenerate H_g (d-wave like) vibrational modes that couple strongly to the LUMO orbitals[7, 8, 9]. Varma, Zaanen and Raghavachari (VZR) [7] proposed that these modes undergo a dynamical JT distortion and calculated the JT induced pair binding

energies at several fillings. These results were used to explain the large T_c 's of fullerenes relative to doped graphite superconductors. VZR used the classical approximation, and restricted their calculation to unimodal distortions (defined later).

Density functional and deformation potential calculations for C_{60}^- [7, 8], estimate $E^{JT} \approx 40$ meV. The important vibrations are in the range of $\hbar\omega \approx 0.1$ – 0.2 eV. Thus, the classical parameter is in fact quite small: $S \simeq 0.2$ – 0.4 . This indicates that the ions' quantum fluctuations cannot be justifiably neglected.

In this paper the vibrations about dynamically distorted buckminsterfullerene ions are quantized semiclassically. I extend previous work of O'Brien, who has solved the $n=1$ case both exactly and semiclassically [10, 11]. First, the unrestricted classical JT distortions are determined. For C_{60}^{n-} , $n \neq 3$, the JT distortions are *unimodal*, i.e. involve one quadrupolar mode in the principle axes frame. For C_{60}^{3-} , the JT distortion is found to be *bimodal*, i.e. two modes are distorted simultaneously. Subsequently, the quantum dynamics parallel and perpendicular to the JT manifold are determined. The excitation spectra and pair binding energies for $n = 1, \dots, 5$ are determined up to second order in S^{-1} . I will show that that Berry phases give rise to selection rules for the pseudo-rotational quantum numbers. These *kinematical* restrictions effect the pairing interaction between electrons, and, therefore, also the superconducting transition temperature.

This discussion is restricted to the simplest electron-vibron interaction model of C_{60} , which captures the symmetries and degeneracies of this system. Electron-electron interactions are presently ignored. The wave functions of the LUMO t_{1u} states are represented by the L=1 triplet $|x\rangle, |y\rangle, |z\rangle$. A single vibronic H_g multiplet is represented by five real coefficients [10, 7],

$$q_m = \sqrt{\pi/5} \sum_{\mu=-2}^2 M_{m\mu} a_{2\mu}$$

$$M_{m \neq 0, \mu} = (2 \operatorname{sign}(m))^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\delta_{m, \mu} + \operatorname{sign}(m) \delta_{m, -\mu}), \quad M_{0, \mu} = \delta_{\mu, 0} \quad (1)$$

where $m, \mu = -2, -1, \dots, 2$, and a_{lm} are the coefficients of the spherical harmonics Y_{lm} [12]. The Hamiltonian is $H = H^{el} + H^{vib}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} H^{el} &= g \frac{\hbar \omega}{2} \begin{pmatrix} q_0 - \sqrt{3} q_2 & -\sqrt{3} q_{-2} & -\sqrt{3} q_1 \\ -\sqrt{3} q_{-2} & q_0 + \sqrt{3} q_2 & -\sqrt{3} q_{-1} \\ -\sqrt{3} q_1 & -\sqrt{3} q_{-1} & -2q_0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ H^{vib} &= \frac{\hbar \omega}{2} \sum_{\mu} (-\partial_{\mu}^2 + q_{\mu}^2), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where g is the dimensionless electron phonon coupling constant. H^{vib} is invariant under rotations of $\vec{q}$ in R^5 and by construction, the eigenvalues of H are invariant under $O(3)$ rotations of the molecule's reference frame. H^{el} is diagonalized by [11]

$$\begin{aligned} H^{el} &= g \frac{\hbar \omega}{2} T^{-1}(\varpi) \begin{pmatrix} z - \sqrt{3} r & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & z + \sqrt{3} r & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -2z \end{pmatrix} T(\varpi) \\ T &= \begin{pmatrix} \cos \psi & \sin \psi & 0 \\ -\sin \psi & \cos \psi & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & 0 & \sin \theta \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \sin \theta & 0 & \cos \theta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \cos \phi & \sin \phi & 0 \\ -\sin \phi & \cos \phi & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where the Euler angles $\varpi = (\phi, \theta, \psi)$ define the $O(3)$ rotation which diagonalizes H^{el} . In the diagonal basis, the only non-zero vibrational components which couple to the electrons are $\vec{q}^{(0)} = (r, 0, z, 0, 0)$.

Since $|\vec{q}|^2$ is invariant under $O(3)$ rotations, the total adiabatic potential is

$$V(z, r) = \frac{\hbar \omega}{2} (z^2 + r^2) + \frac{\hbar \omega g}{2} (n_1(z - \sqrt{3} r) + n_2(z + \sqrt{3} r) - n_3 2z). \quad (4)$$

n_i are the occupations of the orbitals $|i\rangle$, $i = 1, 2, 3$ (ordered from top to bottom in H^{el}), and $\sum_i n_i = n$. V is minimized by the JT configurations

$(\bar{z}, \bar{r}, \bar{n}_i)$, which yield the classical energies $E_n^{cl} = V(\bar{z}_n, \bar{r}_n)$. The distortions are shown in Table I. We choose $S = \frac{1}{2}g^2$ as our semiclassical parameter.

By (1), if we define axis 3 to be at $\tilde{\theta} = 0$, the z mode is described by $\bar{z}\frac{1}{2}(3\cos^2\tilde{\theta} = 1)$, and the r mode by $\bar{r}\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\sin^2\tilde{\theta}\cos(2\tilde{\phi})$. Thus by Table I, $n=1, 2, 4, 5$ have unimodal distortions which are symmetric about the 3 axis, and $n=3$ has a bimodal distortion, about the 3 and 1 axes.

In order to quantize the vibrations, it is useful to express the kinetic energy in terms of small fluctuations about the JT distortion. To that end, we parametrize the JT degenerate manifold, $\{\bar{q}_\mu\}$, in terms of the Euler angles ϖ of Eq. (3):

$$\bar{q}_\mu(\varpi) = \sum_{m, m', \mu'=-2}^2 M_{\mu, m} D_{m, m'}^{(2)}(\varpi) M_{m' \mu'}^{-1} \bar{q}_{\mu'}^{(0)}. \quad (5)$$

$D^{(L)}$ is the irreducible rotational matrix of angular momentum L [12]. The classical kinetic energy can be derived from (5) by the chain rule for differentiation. After some cumbersome, but straightforward, algebra we obtain the compact expression:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}|\dot{\bar{q}}|^2 &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\dot{z}^2 + \dot{r}^2 + \sum_{i=1,3} I_i \omega_i^2 \right), \\ \omega_1 &= -\sin\psi\dot{\theta} + \cos\theta\sin\psi\dot{\phi}, \\ \omega_2 &= \cos\psi\dot{\theta} + \sin\psi\sin\theta\dot{\phi}, \\ \omega_3 &= \dot{\psi} + \cos\theta\dot{\phi} \\ (I_1, I_2, I_3) &= \left((\sqrt{3}z + r)^2, (\sqrt{3}z - r)^2, 4r^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

For finite JT distortions, we can identify $I_i(\bar{z}, \bar{r})$ as moments of inertia in the principle axes frame [12]. Thus, the Euler angles dynamics follow those of a *rigid rotator* [13].

The unimodal and bimodal cases will be discussed separately. For the unimodal cases, $\bar{r} = 0$ and $I_i = \bar{z}^2(3, 3, 0)$ on the JT manifold. The coordinate ψ decouples from the rotational kinetic, which becomes that of a point

particle on the sphere. The quantization of the rotational part is therefore simply $(2I_1)^{-1}\vec{L}^2$ [13]. The remaining coordinates are three harmonic oscillators $r_\gamma = (r \cos(2\psi), r \sin(2\psi), z - \bar{z})$. Including the quadratic potential terms in $V(z, r)$, we arrive at the vibrational eigenenergies:

$$E_n^{uni}[L, n_\gamma] = \hbar\omega \left(\frac{1}{6\bar{z}_n^2} L(L+1) + \sum_{\gamma=1}^3 (n_\gamma + \frac{1}{2}) \right) \quad (7)$$

The rotational parts of the eigenfunctions are

$$\Psi_{Lm}^{uni}(\bar{q}) = Y_{Lm}(\theta, \phi) \prod_{is} |n_{is}\rangle' \quad (8)$$

where $|n_{is}\rangle'$ is an electron Fock state in the principle axes basis. The overlap of this Fock state with a Fock state of the stationary basis is a determinant that contains n factors of $Y_{1\nu_{is}}$. Under reflection, $Y_{Lm}(\pi - \theta, \phi + \pi) \rightarrow (-1)^L Y_{Lm}(\theta, \phi)$. Therefore the electronic wave function yields a Berry phase factor of $(-1)^n$ for rotations between inverted points on the sphere which correspond to closed orbits of $\bar{q}$. Due to the invariance under reflection of $\bar{q}$ (and thus the left hand side of (8)), a selection rule is obtained: $(-1)^{L+n} = 1$. Thus, the ground state for $n=1, 5$ has pseudo-angular momentum $L=1$ that contributes to the zero point energy.

The analysis of the bimodal case of $n=3$ proceeds along similar lines. From Eq.(6) and Table I, we see that $(I_1, I_2, I_3) = 3g^2(4, 1, 1)$. Thus, the kinetic energy includes the rotation of a rigid body with two equal moments of inertia. The quantization of this system is the quantum symmetric top Hamiltonian. Fortunately, its solution is a well-known textbook problem (see e.g. Ref.[1, 12]). In addition to the rotator, there are two harmonic oscillators $r_\gamma = (z - \bar{z}, r - \bar{r})$. The eigenvalues of the bimodal C_{60}^{3-} molecule are thus given by

$$E^{bi} = \hbar\omega \left(\frac{1}{6g^2} L(L+1) - \frac{1}{8g^2} k^2 + \sum_{\gamma=1}^2 (n_\gamma + \frac{1}{2}) \right) \quad (9)$$

where L and k are quantum numbers of $|\vec{L}|^2$ and L_1 respectively, and $k \leq L$. The rotational part of the eigenfunctions are

$$\Psi_{Lmk}^{bi}[\bar{q}] = D_{mk}^{(L)}(\varpi) \prod_{is} |n_{is}\rangle' \quad (10)$$

m is the eigenvalue of L_z , where z is a stationary axis. In distinction to the unimodal case, there is no single reflection which fully classifies the symmetry of the wavefunction. However, one can obtain negative signs by transporting the electronic ground state in certain orbits. We define the rotation of π about principle axis L_i as C_i . The Berry phases associated with these rotations can be read directly from Eq. (3). For example: for $\psi \rightarrow \psi + \pi$ (C_3), the states $|1\rangle$ and $|2\rangle$ get multiplied by (-1) . Since $D_{m,k}^{(L)}$ transform as Y_{Lk} under C_i , it is easy to determine their sign factors. The results are given below:

$$\begin{aligned} C_1 : |1, 0, 2\rangle' &\rightarrow |1, 0, 2\rangle' & C_1 : D_{m,k}^{(L)} &\rightarrow (-1)^k D_{m,k}^{(L)} \\ C_2 : |1, 0, 2\rangle' &\rightarrow -|1, 0, 2\rangle' & C_2 : D_{m,k}^{(L)} &\rightarrow (-1)^{L+k} D_{m,-k}^{(L)} \\ C_3 : |1, 0, 2\rangle' &\rightarrow -|1, 0, 2\rangle' & C_3 : D_{m,k}^{(L)} &\rightarrow (-1)^L D_{m,-k}^{(L)} . \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Clearly, $\bar{q}$, being coefficients of quadrupole distortions, is invariant under C_1, C_2, C_3 . Thus, C_i describe closed orbits in R^5 . In order to satisfy (10) and using the degeneracy of E^{bi} for $k \rightarrow -k$, we find that L *must be odd and k must be even*. In particular, the ground state of (9) is given by $L=1$, and $k=0$.

A relevant quantity for superconductivity is the “pair binding” energy[7, 14]

$$U_n = E_{n+1} + E_{n-1} - 2E_n , \quad (12)$$

where E_n are the total ground state energies. The calculation above finds that all odd fillings $n=1, 3, 5$ have the same semiclassical pair binding energy $U_{2n+1} = -2S + 1 - \frac{1}{3}S^{-1}$.

In Table I we summarize the results for the vibrational contributions to the ground state energies and pair binding energies of C_{60}^{n-} . The semiclassical results contain the leading three terms in the $1/S$ expansion. However,

one may rightfully worry about higher order corrections since for C_{60} the experimental estimate is $S = 0.2\text{--}0.4$. In comparing O'Brien's exact results for $n=1$ [11] to the semiclassical expression for E_1 given in Table 1, we find that for $S \geq 0.25$, the error in the semiclassical approximation is bounded by $0.2\hbar\omega$. For $S < 0.25$, the semiclassical error diverges rapidly. Using $S=0.25$ for buckminsterfullerene, the semiclassical result is that U_3 is dominated by the rotational energy, which *enhances* the pair binding energy from its classical value by the significant amount of $\hbar\omega/3$. We must beware however, that $S=0.25$ is pushing the semiclassical expansion quite far. Since other important interactions have not been considered here (e.g. intermolecular hopping and electron-electron interactions[14]), I refrain from inferring quantitative predictions for T_c . The results suggest that further investigations of (3) and its extensions would be worthwhile.

In conclusion, I have shown that the dynamical Jahn teller effect in C_{60}^{n-} involves several interesting features. For $n = 1, 2, 4, 5$ the molecule distorts unimodally, giving rise to a pseudo-angular momentum spectrum, plus three harmonic oscillators. For $n=3$, there is a bimodal distortion, which generates a spectrum of a symmetric top rotator, plus two harmonic oscillators. The Berry phases of the electronic wave functions have been calculated. They determine the allowed pseudo-angular momenta quantum numbers. It would be interesting if further spectroscopic investigations of C_{60} ions could resolve the special structure predicted by the Eqs.(7,9).

Acknowledgements

I am indebted to S. Doniach for his insightful suggestion that the MAB effect might be important in buckminsterfullerene, and to J.E. Avron for valuable discussions. This paper was supported in part by grants from the US-Israel Binational Science Foundation, the Fund for Promotion of Research at the Technion, and the US Department of Energy No. DE-FG02-91ER45441.

References

- [1] L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshitz, “Quantum Mechanics” (Pergamon, 1976), Ch. 13.
- [2] H.A. Jahn and E. Teller, Proc. Roy. Soc. A, **161** 220, 1937.
- [3] H.C. Longuet-Higgins, Adv. Spect. **2** 429, (1961), and references therein; H.C. Longuet-Higgins, Proc. Roy. Soc. London, **A344**, 147 (1975); C.A. Mead and D.G. Truhlar, J. Chem. Phys., **70**, 2284 (1979).
- [4] G. Delacrétaz, E.R. Grant, R.L. Whetten, L. Woste and J. W. Zwanziger, Phys. Rev. Lett., **56**, 2598 (1986).
- [5] “Geometric Phases In Physics”, Eds. A. Shapere and F. Wilczek, World Scientific (1989).
- [6] A. F. Hebard, “Physics Today”, Nov. 1992, P. 26, and references therein.
- [7] C.M. Varma, J. Zaanen, K. Raghavachari, Science, **254**, 989 (1991).
- [8] M. Schluter, M. Lanoo, M. Needles, G.A. Baraff and D. Tomanek, Phys. Rev. Lett.**68**, 526 (1991),
- [9] R.A. Jishi, M.S. Dresselhaus, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 2597 (1992); M.G. Mitch, S.J. Chase, and J.S. Lannin, Phys. Rev. B **46** 3696 (1992).
- [10] M.C.M O’Brien, Phys. Rev. **187**, 407 (1969)
- [11] M.C.M O’Brien, J. Phys. C **4**, 2524 (1971).
- [12] A.R. Edmonds, “Angular Momentum In Quantum Mechanics”, (Princeton University press, 1974).

- [13] One should not confuse the pseudo rotations of Eq. (6), which describe propagating vibrational waves, with real rotations of the molecule. Those are assumed to be frozen out by crystal fields at the temperatures of interest.
- [14] S. Chakravarty, M. Gelfand and S. Kivelson, *Science*, **254**, 970 (1991); G.N. Murthy and A. Auerbach, *Phys. Rev. B***46**, 331, (1992).

Table I

n	$(\bar{z}_n, \bar{r}_n)$	$(\bar{n}_1, \bar{n}_2, \bar{n}_3)$	$E_n/(\hbar\omega)$	$U_n/(\hbar\omega)$
0	(0, 0)	(0,0,0)	$\frac{5}{2}$	
1	$(g, 0)$ (uni)	(0,0,1)	$-S + \frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{6}S^{-1}$	$-2S + 1 - \frac{1}{3}S^{-1}$
2	$(2g, 0)$ (uni)	(0,0,2)	$-4S + \frac{3}{2}$	$4S - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3}S^{-1}$
3	$(\frac{3}{2}g, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}g)$ (bi)	(1,0,2)	$-3S + 1 + \frac{1}{6}S^{-1}$	$-2S + 1 - \frac{1}{3}S^{-1}$
4	$(-2g, 0)$ (uni)	(2,2,0)	$-4S + \frac{3}{2}$	$4S - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3}S^{-1}$
5	$(-g, 0)$ (uni)	(1,2,2)	$-S + \frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{6}S^{-1}$	$-2S + 1 - \frac{1}{3}S^{-1}$
6	(0, 0)	(2,2,2)	$\frac{5}{2}$	